

Seshat's WTF? Method v.2.1

A Comprehensive Critical Thinking Framework

Integrating Advanced Methods for Logical Inquiry and Decision-Making

Author: Marie Seshat Landry

Version: 2.1 – February 2025

Abstract

Seshat's WTF? Method v.2.1 is an **enhanced critical thinking framework** that integrates **advanced problem-solving techniques, falsification strategies, and structured inquiry models**. It expands on the **original WTF 1.0 methodology**, incorporating **iterative refinement, adversarial intelligence strategies, and AI-assisted decision-making**.

This method is designed for use in:

- ✓ **Intelligence analysis (OSINT, HUMINT, and strategic research)**
- ✓ **Business decision-making and risk assessment**
- ✓ **Scientific research, NLP-driven insights, and automated reasoning**

By applying **structured inquiry techniques, logical verification, and multi-perspective evaluation**, the framework ensures **bias-resistant, falsifiable, and evidence-based conclusions**.

1. Introduction

Modern intelligence and research challenges require a **structured critical thinking framework** that:

- **Breaks down complex issues** into systematic components.
- **Eliminates bias** through falsification and adversarial analysis.
- **Uses structured inquiry techniques** for comprehensive investigation.
- **Integrates machine-learning models** to refine human decision-making.

Seshat's WTF? Method **v.2.1** expands on **WTF 1.0** by incorporating **advanced cognitive models** such as **iterative falsification**, **probability-driven reasoning**, and **synthetic intelligence analysis**.

2. Core Structure of WTF? v.2.1

This methodology follows a **five-phase process**, ensuring **logical consistency**, **falsification**, and **adaptive decision-making**.

Step 1: The "WTF?" Trigger – Recognizing Cognitive Conflict

Objective: Identify **conflicting data**, **logical inconsistencies**, or **deceptive narratives** that require further investigation.

✓ **Trigger Criteria:**

- Information appears **contradictory**, **illogical**, or **emotionally charged**.
- Conflicting **data sources** or **interpretations** exist.
- Claims lack **empirical support** or **repeatable verification**.

Action: **Pause** and **engage structured inquiry**.

Step 2: Structured Inquiry – The 5W+1H Expanded Framework

Objective: Dissect the problem by addressing **six foundational investigative questions** plus an **iterative truth-seeking cycle**.

♦ **5W+1H Enhanced Methodology:**

- **Who?** – Identifies key actors, sources, and motivations.
- **What?** – Defines the issue and examines core claims.
- **Where?** – Assesses the contextual and geopolitical relevance.
- **When?** – Establishes the timeline, patterns, and historical context.
- **Why?** – Identifies incentives, biases, and underlying agendas.
- **How?** – Investigates **causation vs. correlation** and **mechanisms of influence**.

✓ **Iterative Truth-Seeking Process:**

After answering the **5W+1H**, the inquiry continues with:

- **What's missing?** – Identifying **information gaps** and **blind spots**.

- **What are the contradictions?** – Recognizing **logical inconsistencies**.
 - **What are the alternative explanations?** – Exploring **probabilistic reasoning**.
-

Step 3: Advanced Critical Thinking Models

Objective: Apply **structured reasoning techniques** to **test, falsify, and refine** conclusions.

- ◆ **Socratic Adversarial Questioning**

- What **assumptions** does this claim rely on?
- How could this information be **misinterpreted or manipulated**?
- If this claim were **false**, what would that imply?
- What counter-evidence exists?

- ◆ **Bayesian Probability Analysis**

- What **prior probability** does this claim have?
- How does **new evidence** update the likelihood of it being true?
- Are there **statistical or cognitive biases** influencing perception?

- ◆ **Iterative Falsification (Karl Popper's Model)**

- What **strongest counter-arguments** exist?
- Can the **claim withstand rigorous falsification**?
- What level of **certainty** is achievable given available data?

✓ **Outcome:** Hypotheses that survive **Socratic, Bayesian, and Falsification Testing** move to the next phase.

Step 4: Multi-Perspective Synthesis

Objective: Integrate **alternative viewpoints** to achieve a **bias-resistant** conclusion.

- ◆ **The Six Thinking Hats Method (Edward de Bono)**

1. **White Hat** – Data and factual analysis.
2. **Red Hat** – Emotional and intuitive response.
3. **Black Hat** – Risk and logical skepticism.
4. **Yellow Hat** – Benefits and advantages.
5. **Green Hat** – Creative alternative solutions.
6. **Blue Hat** – Meta-analysis and system structuring.

✓ **Outcome:** A holistic, multi-perspective understanding of the issue.

Step 5: Structured Intelligence Reporting & Decision Making

Objective: Formulate **actionable intelligence** using structured reasoning.

- ♦ **The Structured Intelligence Report Model (SIRM)**

1. **Summary** – Core findings in **factual, neutral language**.
2. **Key Evidence** – Verifiable data supporting conclusions.
3. **Competing Hypotheses** – Alternative explanations.
4. **Falsification Tests** – How conclusions were stress-tested.
5. **Confidence Level** – Bayesian probability of accuracy.
6. **Recommended Actions** – Decision-making framework.

✓ **Final Step:** Iterate conclusions as new data emerges.

3. Integration in OSINT, AI, and Strategic Analysis

The **WTF? v.2.1 Method** is designed for:

- **Intelligence Agencies** – OSINT, HUMINT, Cybersecurity.
 - **AI and NLP Models** – Automated misinformation detection.
 - **Corporate Strategy** – Competitive intelligence and risk assessment.
 - **Academic Research** – Ensuring logical rigor in interdisciplinary studies.
- ♦ **Machine Learning Integration:**
 - **Bayesian NLP Models** for probabilistic reasoning.
 - **Adversarial AI Testing** for bias mitigation.
 - **Neural Falsification Frameworks** for data integrity validation.
-

4. Daily Practice and Mastery

To reinforce **WTF? 2.1**, practice:

- ✓ **Case Study Simulations** – Apply all five steps to real-world issues.
 - ✓ **Logical Fallacy Drills** – Identify weak arguments in media.
 - ✓ **Adversarial Debates** – Test arguments under pressure.
 - ✓ **AI-Assisted Analysis** – Use **NLP** and **probability models**.
-

5. Conclusion: The Evolution of Critical Thinking

Seshat's WTF? v.2.1 represents an **evolution beyond basic critical thinking** into a **self-correcting, adversarially tested, probability-driven intelligence model**.

- ✓ **Bias-resistant, multi-method analysis.**
- ✓ **Falsification-driven to eliminate misinformation.**
- ✓ **Scalable for AI, OSINT, business, and academia.**

🔥 **WTF? 3.0 and 4.0 will introduce automated AI-based falsification models, synthetic intelligence synthesis, and deep cognitive adversarial frameworks.**

